

1 Thomas A. Connelly (AZ Bar #019430)
 2 Robert T. Mills (AZ Bar #018853)
 3 Sean A. Woods (AZ Bar #028930)
MILLS + WOODS LAW PLLC
 4 5055 North 12th Street, Suite 101
 Phoenix, Arizona 85014
 Telephone 480.999.4556
 docket@millsandwoods.com
 5

6 DeeAn Gillespie Strub (AZ Bar #009987)
 7 Jenny D. Jansch (AZ Bar #024431)
GILLESPIE, SHIELDS & TAYLOR
 8 7319 North 16th Street
 Phoenix, Arizona 85020
 Telephone: (602) 870-9700
 9 Fax: (602) 870-9783
 mailroom@gillaw.com
 10 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

MILLS + Woods LAW, PLLC
 5055 North 12th Street, Suite 101
 Phoenix, AZ 85014-2555
 480.999.4556

11
 12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 13 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

14 Jessica Kahraman, *et al.*,
 15 Plaintiffs,
 16 v.
 17 State of Arizona, *et al.*,
 18 Defendants.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-00375-PHX-SRB

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
 TIME FOR PLAINTIFFS TO
 RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS'
 MOTION FOR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT [DOC. 216, 217]**

20 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A) and LRCiv 7.3(a), Plaintiffs make this
 21 motion for an enlargement of time to file and serve their response to *Defendants' Motion*
 22 *for Summary Judgment* [Doc. 216] and Defendants' Statement of Facts in Support of
 23 Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 217], both filed on 16 December 2024 (collectively,
 24 the "motion"). Plaintiffs make this request in good faith and not for purposes of delay.

25 Defendants have been promising to file a motion for summary judgment for many
 26 months, at least since August. On 16 December 2024, at the last opportunity to do so,
 27 Defendants finally filed their motion along with their separate statement of facts with
 28 voluminous exhibits in support of that motion. Defendants filed 87 separate exhibits in

1 support of their motion; those 87 exhibits span a robust 1,735 pages. Due process entitles
 2 Plaintiffs to adequate time to respond to the motion. Clearly, a significant amount of time
 3 will be necessary to adequately process those 87 exhibits and 1,735 pages. Filing at the
 4 busiest holiday part of the year presents a severe challenge to being able to intelligently
 5 and fully respond within the standard 30-days' time. Like many others at this holiday time
 6 of the year, Plaintiffs' lead counsel has travel plans taking him and his family out of the
 7 country from 20 December 2024 until January 18, 2025. Plaintiffs contend these set of
 8 circumstances as further discussed below present good cause justifying an extension of
 9 time to respond to the motion from 15 January 2025 until 18 February 2025. Plaintiffs
 10 requested that Defendants stipulate to an extension until 18 February 2025, but they
 11 refused.¹

12 Defendants are expected to oppose this motion claiming the requested extension is
 13 prejudicial to them due to the current scheduling order trial date of 24 March 2025. See
 14 Doc. 196. Plaintiffs would not oppose an extension of the trial date to accommodate full
 15 summary judgment briefing (and oral argument, if necessary).

16 Nonetheless, Defendants' prejudice argument is somewhat specious. A brief perusal
 17 of the motion (Doc. 216) and scrutiny of the *Table of Contents of Exhibits* (Doc. 217-1 at
 18 1-3) demonstrates several things.

- 19 • *First*, the motion is supported largely by documents or information
 20 Defendants have had in their possession or control since February 2023 and
 21 going as far back as 2018. For instance, Exhibits 201-281² are juvenile court
 22 pleadings, orders, and the like that Defendants have had in their possession
 23 since they were first filed in the underlying juvenile court matter in 2018 and
 24 2019. Similarly, Exhibit 1 consists of medical records produced by former
 25 Defendant Banner Hospital on 16 February 2023. Despite having all this

27 ¹ When Defendants rejected an extension until 18 February 2025, Plaintiffs requested they
 28 stipulate to an extension until 31 January 2025. Defendants also refused that request.

2 ² Defendants numbered their exhibits 1-5, 201-281, leaving a gap at 6-200.

1 information in hand from the very beginning of this lawsuit, Defendants
 2 waited until the last possible date, at the busiest holiday/family time of the
 3 year, to file a dispositive motion supported by 87 exhibits spanning 1,735
 4 pages. That tactical decision prejudices Plaintiffs.

- 5 • *Second*, the motion relies primarily on legal arguments about collateral
 6 estoppel and issue preclusion and does not turn on the facts developed during
 7 the discovery phase of this case. Indeed, the only testimonial exhibit
 8 supporting the motion that Defendants did not have in their possession or
 9 control since the onset of this matter is the testimony of Dr. Ryan Stewart,
 10 who was deposed on 26 February 2024, excerpts of which comprise
 11 Defendants' Exhibit 2. The other deposition excerpts supporting the motion
 12 (Exhibits 3-5) are from two existing Defendants (Madison Bell and Mecca
 13 Temple) and one prior Defendant (Sarah Kramer), all deposed in August and
 14 September, all of whom are, or were, employees of Defendant Arizona
 15 Department of Child Safety. Given that Defendants could have supported a
 16 motion for summary judgment with affidavits from Bell, Temple, and
 17 Kramer, they did not need to wait to see when—or if—Plaintiffs would
 18 depose Bell, Temple, and Kramer. Rather, based on the exhibits supporting
 19 the motion, Defendants could have filed it as early as February 2024, after
 20 taking Dr. Stewart's deposition, with supporting affidavits from Bell,
 21 Temple, and Kramer, and at a time well before additional significant
 22 resources were expended in discovery and on experts. This tactical decision
 23 by Defendants also prejudiced Plaintiffs.³

24
 25 ³ Defendants cannot reasonable argue that they needed the deposition testimony of Bell,
 26 Temple, and Kramer to lay foundation for the 81 juvenile court records used as exhibits for
 27 three reasons: (1) they could have given the same testimony by affidavit, (2) Plaintiffs
 28 offered to stipulate to foundation for those records when Defendants first made it known
 they intended to file for summary judgment using those records, and (3) they are public
 records of which this Court can take judicial notice. This is another reason Defendants did

- 1 • *Third*, conspicuously absent from Defendants' exhibits are transcripts from
2 the depositions of Plaintiff Jessica Kahraman, taken on 14 June 2024, and a
3 third-party witness, Carla White, taken on 8 and 18 November 2024; any of
4 the 100 exhibits marked by Plaintiffs at the depositions taken in this matter;
5 or any of the tens of thousands of pages of records produced by the parties
6 and former parties in this matter (acknowledging Exhibit 1 as the only such
7 exhibit). This, too, demonstrates that the motion is largely legal in nature (as
8 opposed to factual) and could have been filed much earlier in the life span of
9 this matter.

10 If there is any prejudice caused by the timing of Defendants' motion, it accrues to Plaintiffs.

11 For all the above reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request an extension of time until
12 18 February 2025 to file their response to Defendants' motion for summary judgment.
13 Plaintiffs would also not oppose the Court extending the 24 March 2025 trial date to
14 accommodate a modified briefing schedule (and oral argument, if necessary).

15 A proposed Order is also submitted for the Court's consideration.

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 19th day of December 2024.
2
3

4 **MILLS + WOODS LAW PLLC**
5
6

7 By /s/ Thomas A. Connely
8 Thomas A. Connely
9 Robert T. Mills
10 Sean A. Woods
11 5055 North 12th Street, Suite 101
12 Phoenix, AZ 85014
13
14

15 **GILLESPIE, SHIELDS & TAYLOR**
16 DeeAn Gillespie Strub
17 Jenny D. Jansch
18 7319 North 16th Street
19 Phoenix, AZ 85020
20
21

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 19, 2024, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to be filed electronically with the Clerk's Office through the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to be served on all counsel of record via the Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Thomas A. Connelly

MILLS + WOODS LAW, PLLC
5055 North 12th Street, Suite 101
Phoenix, AZ 85014
480.999.4556